

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated June 1, 2004, no claims have been cancelled, amended or added. Claims 1-29 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application is requested.

### II. Interview Summary

On June 16, 2004 and June 17, 2004, an interview was conducted between the Examiner and Jason S. Feldmar (Reg. No. 39,187). Specifically, the rejection of the present claims was based on the NetMeeting reference. However, the valid date of the NetMeeting reference is April 22, 2004 which is well after the filing date of the present application – July 26, 2001. The invalidity of the Net Meeting reference based on the date of the reference was discussed. The Examiner agreed that the reference was invalid but requested that a formal response be filed pointing out the invalidity.

### III. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (2)-(3) of the Office Action, claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Windows NetMeeting,

<http://www.microsoft.com/windows/NetMeeting/Features/default.ASP> (NetMeeting) and "Markup File for Asynchronized Collaboration on an Image Viewer Application," (IBM).

Applicant's attorney respectfully traverses these rejections. As indicated during the Interview with the Examiner, pages 1 and 4 of the NetMeeting reference (which were both relied upon in the Office Action) are clearly dated April 22, 2004 – a date that is subsequent to the filing date of the present application – July 26, 2001. Accordingly, the NetMeeting reference relied upon is invalid as prior art against the present application.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a). Further, Applicant's attorney submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are allowable over the references. Further, dependent claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-29 are submitted to be allowable over the references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 11, and 20, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-29 recite additional novel elements not shown by the references.

IV. Conclusion


In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: August 27, 2004

By:   
Name: Jason S. Feldmar  
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/sjm